

## PATENT

## REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application. Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102*

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Kumar.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." M.P.E.P. § 2131 (July 1998) (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Applicant's respectfully submits that Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 11, 12, and 14-18 are not anticipated by Kumar for the reasons and explanations set out below, and Applicant's respectfully request reconsideration of Examiner's rejections.

The discussion that follows is carried out with respect to claim 1, but the discussion applies to independent claims 12, 16-18, 19, and 23 as well.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant's respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Kumar. In particular, Kumar does not disclose or teach the following element of claim 1:

"re-synchronizing the PPP link if the remote station is associated with the new network server."

With respect to claim 1 Applicants carefully reviewed Kumar and could not find any disclosure of "re-synchronizing the PPP link if the remote station is associated with the new network server." Although Kumar discloses a high level description of synchronization when a mobile station is in soft-handoff with at least two base stations and the FSD function over the backhaul, Kumar nowhere mentions "re-synchronizing the PPP link if the remote station is associated with the new network server." (Kumar col. 3 lines 5-15). Independent claims 12 and 16-18 include this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 12, and 16-18 are in a condition for allowance. Dependent claims 3, 4, 9, and 11 dependent from independent claim 1, and it follows claims 3, 4, 9, and 11 are also in a condition for allowance.

Attorney Docket No.: 000256

Customer No.: 23696

**PATENT**

Dependent claim 14 depends from independent claim 12, and it follows that claim 14 is also in a condition for allowance.

***Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103***

Claims 19, 21-23, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar. Claims 2, 13, 20, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar in view of Rasanen. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar in view of Ludwig. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar in view of Kalliokulju. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumar in view of Basilier.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach each or suggest all the claim limitations. "The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in Applicants' disclosure". In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

With respect to claims 2, 5-7, 8, 10, 13, 19, 20, 21-23, 24, and 25-26 Applicant's submit claims 2, 5-7, 8, 10, 13, 19, 20, 21-23, 24, and 25-26 are not rendered obvious by Kumar and/or Rasanen, and/or Kalliokulju, and/or Basilier for the reasons and explanations set forth above. Applicant's respectfully request reconsideration of claims 2, 5-7, 8, 10, 13, 19, 20, 21-23, 24, and 25-26 in view of the above discussion. Claims 2, 5-7, 8, 10, 13 depend from claim 1 which is in a condition for allowance and it follows that dependent claims 2, 5-7, 8, 10, 13 are also in a condition for allowance. Applicants submit independent claim 19 is in a condition for allowance for the reasons and explanations set forth above with respect to claim 1. Independent claims 20-22 depend from independent claim 19 and it follows that claims 20-22 are also in a condition for allowance. Applicants submit independent claim 23 is in a condition for allowance for the reasons and explanations set forth above with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 24-26 depend from independent claim 23 and it follows that claims 24-26 are also in a condition for allowance.

## PATENT

## CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments contained herein, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested.

Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 19, 2005

By: 

Dean J. Fricarico, Reg. No. 53,703  
(858) 845-0006

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 658-5787  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502